

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephone call on January 26, 2006 to clarify the restriction-type objection of the Notice of Non-compliant Amendment, namely the inclusion of a second instruction. In light of the objection, the present amendment eliminates the inclusion of a second instruction.

Claims 98-108 were pending and claims 98-106 have been amended. New claims 109-160 have been added. Support for the amendments and the new claims can be found throughout the specification and figures. For example, see page 46, line 3 to page 47 line 18, page 68, line 9 to page 71, line 4, figure 2, and/or figure 9.

In the Office communication mailed on 04/21/05, the claim 98 was rejected under 35 USC § 102 as being unpatentable over an Alhara et al. Japanese Patent JP410229413A, hereinafter known as Alhara. Claims 99-108 were rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Alhara in view of Koether US patent 5,875,430, hereinafter known as Koether. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and submits that neither Alhara nor Koether, alone or in combination, discloses each and every limitation of now pending claims 98-160.

Specifically, neither Alhara nor Koether, either alone or in combination, discloses one or more processors being further programmed i) to receive a communication relating to management of said building from a device associated with at least one of said tenants, said communication including data indicating an instruction being associated with a task performed by said individual, said individual being associated with a front desk of said

building, a front gate of said building, or a combination thereof, ii) to associate said instruction with said at least one of said tenants using an identifier, iii) to store said instruction and said identifier on said computer system, and iv) to enable said individual to search said central computer to obtain said instruction using a computing device associated with said individual, as required by claim 98. Claims 99-108 depend from claim 98 and distinguish from Alhara and Koether for at least the same reason.

Further, neither Alhara nor Koether, either alone or in combination, discloses receiving an instruction via a computing device associated with a tenant associated with a building, said instruction being associated with a task performed by an individual associated with a front desk of said building, a front gate of said building, or a combination thereof, associating said instruction with said tenant using an identifier, storing said instruction and said identifier on a central computer, and enabling said individual to search said central computer to obtain said instruction using a computing device associated with said individual, as required by claim 109. Claims 110-158 depend from claim 109 and distinguish from Alhara and Koether for at least the same reason. Independent claims 159 and 160 include the same limitations and distinguish from Alhara and Koether for at least the same reason.

Applicant's discussion of particular positions of the Examiner does not constitute a concession with respect to any positions that are not expressly contested by the Applicant. Applicant's emphasis of particular reasons why the claims are patentable does not imply that there are not other sufficient reasons why the claims are patentable.

Applicant's amendment of the claims does not constitute a concession that the claims are not allowable in their unamended form.

In view of the foregoing remarks and the inability of the prior art, alone or in combination, to anticipate, suggest or make obvious the subject matter as a whole of the invention disclosed and claimed in this application, all the claims are submitted to be in a condition for allowance, and notice thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also respectfully requested that, in order to expedite prosecution of this application, the undersigned be contacted at the telephone number indicated below before issuance of another Office Action if the Examiner intends to apply a new prior art reference against the current claims. Included with the previous reply was an RCE, its fees, and fees for a three month extension of time. Since the number of pending claims does not exceed the number of claims previously paid for, the Applicant believes that no excess claim fees are needed. Please apply any required charges or overpayment credits to deposit account 50-3081.

Respectfully submitted,

PROSKAUER ROSE LLP

By 

David Miranda
Reg. No. 42,898

Date: February 10, 2006

Proskauer Rose LLP
One International Place
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 526-9620
Facsimile: (617) 526-9899